

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-73, 81, 84-88, 96, 99-103, 111, 114-118, 121-124, 127-130, and 133-136 are cancelled. Claims 74-80, 82-83, 89-95, 97-98, 104-110, 112-113, 119-120, 125-126, 131-132 and 137-166 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, the Examiner raised the following art rejections:

I. Claims 74-78, 80, 82, 83, 89-93, 95, 97, 98, 104-108, 110, 112, 113, 120, 126, and 132 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hishida (U.S. Patent No. 6,477,549) in view of Wang (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,385). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

As an example, amended claim 74 calls for:

obtaining at least one style sheet via a distribution channel over a second medium that is a different medium than the first medium over which the digital broadcast signals are received, the at least one obtained style sheet including format information used to set the display format of images to be displayed by a given display device;

Neither Hishida nor Wang discloses or suggests obtaining a style sheet over a second medium that is a different medium than a first medium over which digital broadcast signals are received.

Rather, as pointed out in the Amendment dated January 31, 2007, Hishida describes receiving both a style sheet and a document body over the same medium and does not disclose or suggest receiving the document body over a different medium than the medium over which the style sheets are received. Similarly, Wang describes receiving both EPG data and digital television signals over the same medium and neither discloses nor suggests receiving the EPG data over a different medium than

the medium over which the digital television signals are received. Namely, neither reference discloses or suggests dividing its transmissions between different media.

Further, even if the references are combined in the manner asserted by the Examiner, because neither Hishida nor Wang discloses or suggests dividing its transmission between different media, the asserted combination at best teaches receiving both digital broadcast signals and a style sheet over only a first medium regardless of whether the first medium is that described by Hishida or that described by Wang. The asserted combination would not lead a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art to receive a style sheet over a second medium that is different than the first medium over which digital broadcast signals are received.

It follows that neither Hishida nor Wang, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the method set out in claim 74, and claim 74 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Independent claims 89 and 104 each include limitations similar to those set out above in the excerpt of claim 74. Therefore, claims 89 and 104 are each distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

Claims 75-78, 80, 82, 83, and 120 depend from claim 74; claims 90-93, 95, 97, 98, and 126 depend from claim 89; and claims 105-108, 110, 112, 113, and 132 depend from claim 104. Therefore each of these claims is distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

II. Claims 119, 125, and 131 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hishida and Wang as applied to claims 74, 89, and 104 above and further in view of Yogeshwar (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,232). Applicant submits

that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claim 119 depends from claim 74, claim 125 depends from claim 89, and claim 131 depend from claim 104. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over Hishida and Wang for at least the same reasons.

Yogeshwar does not remedy these deficiencies.

III. Claims 79, 94, 109, 137-144, 146-154, 156-164, and 166 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hishida and Wang and further in view of Hill (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,714). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Independent claims 79, 94 and 109, as amended, each include limitations similar to those set out above in the excerpt of claim 74. Therefore, each of claims 79, 94 and 109 is each distinguishable over Hishida and Wang for at least the same reasons.

Hill does not remedy these deficiencies.

Claims 137-144 and 146 depend from claim 79, claims 147-154 and 156 depend from claim 94, and claims 157-164, and 166 depend from claim 109. Each of these claims is therefore distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons described above regarding the claim from which it depends.

IV. Claims 145, 155, and 165 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hishida, Wang, and Hill as applied to claims 79, 94, and 109 above and further in view of Yogeshwar. Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claim 145 depends from claim 79, claim 155 depends from claim 94, and claim 165 depends from claim 109. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over Hishida, Wang, and Hill at least for the reasons described above regarding the

claims from which it depends.

Yogeshwar does not remedy these deficiencies.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

769623\_1.DOC